	Casesee 6:06-00 3708 SBS BAD Document 11415	ffileed/044/1123/20007PagBeageof13of 3	
1 2	EDWIN K. PRATHER (Cal. Bar No. 190536) CLARENCE & DYER LLP 899 Ellis Street		
2	San Francisco, CA 94109-7807		
4	Telephone: (415) 749-1800 Facsimile: (415) 749-1694 Email: <u>eprather@clarencedyer.com</u>		
5	Attorneys for Defendants		
6	SYNPEP CORPORATION and CHI YANG		
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
8	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
9	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION		
10			
11	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	Case No.: CR06-0374 SBA	
12	Plaintiff,	AMENDED STIPULATION AND	
13	V.	APROXIMIZATION OF AND EXCLUSION OF	
14	SYNPEP CORPORATION and CHI YANG,	TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT, 18 U.S.C. § 3161 ET SEQ.	
15	Defendants.		
16			
17		1	
18	In this proposed stipulated order, the parties jointly request that the Court continue the		
19	status conference, currently set for April 24, 2007, to May 29, 2007.		
20	At the last calling of the case, the government indicated to the Court that she would be in		
21	trial until early April. The government's case, United States v. Jimmy Quan, et al., is still on-		
22	going in this district before Judge Shubb (visiting from E.D. Cal.). The indicated end date of the		
23	trial is now May 4, 2007.		
24	The instant case involves allegations of laboratory fraud regarding the manufacture of		
25	synthetic peptide proteins and is highly complex. The discovery in this case is enormous and		
26	difficult to understand. For the past several months, both parties have continued examine the		
27	evidence using experts in the manufacture of synthetic peptide proteins. On March 30, 2007, the		
28	parties met to discuss the case and what each party had learned from their continuing review of		
	the discovery. At that meeting, the parties were able to narrow the issues involved in the case		

considerably and also had discussion regarding settlement. Both parties agree that further
 meetings after AUSA Geis is available would be highly productive and might settle the case.

AUSA Geis has indicated that she will need a few weeks after her trial ends to review the
file and evidence presented by the defense. The parties plan on having another meeting or series
of meetings in mid to late May.

Both the schedule and unavailability of AUSA Geis and the on-going discussions
between the parties warrant a short continuance of this case. Additionally, the parties will
continue to use the time to review evidence with peptide experts.

9 Therefore, for good cause shown, the status conference in the above-captioned matter should be continued from April 24, 2007, until May 29, 2007 at 9:00 a.m. Defense counsel 10 11 contact the Court's clerk who indicated that the Court is currently available on May 29th. 12 Additionally, the Court should exclude the period from April 24, 2007, until May 29, 2007 under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161 et seq. The parties stipulate and agree that 13 14 the ends of justice served by the continuance requested herein outweigh the best interests of the 15 public and the defendant in a speedy trial because the failure to grant a continuance would 16 unreasonably deny adequate preparation of counsel in this case in which the Court has already 17 made a complexity finding. See 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(ii).

18 IT IS SO STIPULATED:

26

27

28

 19
 DATED: April 12, 2007
 /s/: Edwin

 20
 EDWIN k

 21
 Attorney f

 22
 CORPOR

 23
 JATED: April 12, 2007
 /s/: Stacey

 24
 DATED: April 12, 2007
 /s/: Stacey

 25
 STACEY

/s/: Edwin K. Prather EDWIN K. PRATHER Attorney for defendants SYNPEP CORPORATION and CHI YANG

<u>/s/: Stacey P. Geis</u> STACEY P. GEIS Assistant United States Attorney

	Cases 4:06:06:00:3704:388 BAD 000000 ent 11:41.5 Filed 0044/1123/20007 Page 3:e63 of 3		
1			
2	(X2X (X) X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X		
3	Based on the reasons provided in the stipulation of the parties above, the Court FINDS		
4	that:		
5	The unavailability and schedule of the government as well as the on-going discussions		
6	between the parties warrants a short continuance;		
7 8	The Court has previously made a finding that this case is complex due to the nature of the		
9	subject matter, volume of discovery and nature of the prosecution; and		
10	The ends of justice served by the continuance requested herein outweigh the best		
11	interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial and failure to deny counsel for the parties the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise		
12			
13	of due diligence.		
14 15	Based on these findings, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:		
16	The status conference in the above-captioned matter shall be continued from April 24,		
17	2007, until May 29, 2007 at 9:00 a.m. The period from April 24, 2007, until May 29, 2007 shall		
18	be exclude from the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161 et seq., pursuant to 18 U.S.C.		
19	§§ 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(ii).		
20 21	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
21 22			
23	DATED: 4/13/07		
24	SZUNDKA B. ARMSTRON U.S. District Court Judge		
25	Ŭ		
26			
27			
28			
	AMENDED STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER FOR CONTINUANCE AND EXCLUSION OF TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT, 18 U.S.C. § 3161 ET SEQ. [Case No.: CR 06-0374 SBA] 3		